

581,301


**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

 Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

07/581,301 09/12/90 KUBOTA

M 520.29337X00

MYRACLE, J

 ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS
STE. 600
1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

265

02/27/91

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

 A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-7 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☒ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☒ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Eguchi et al. in view of Minagawa.

Eguchi et al. discloses all the subject matter claimed, note Fig. 1, except for the limitation that the transducer be a resistive type.

Minagawa teaches the use of a resistive transducer in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of measuring throttle angle.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a resistive transducer of the type shown by Minagawa in order to measure the throttle angle of Eguchi et al. as an alternate to the transducer shown by Eguchi et al.

Serial No. 581,301

-3-

Art Unit 265

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Eguchi et al. in view of Minagawa as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Overcash et al.

Overcash et al. teach in col. 6 lines 60-65 the use of a conductive plastic resistive material. Obviously, such a material could be used with the modified Eguchi et al device as an alternate to the resistive material of Minagawa.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Myracle whose telephone number is (703) 308-2682.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0962.

J.MYRACLE:rf
February 20, 1991



JERRY W. MYRACLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 265